



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

counsel for the plaintiff remarked in his argument to the jury that if they gave a verdict too small it would not be raised, but that if they gave one too large the appellate court would correct it by cutting it down, so that if they erred they should err on the side that could be corrected by the appellate court. These remarks the court stamped with its unqualified disapproval. After showing that the power of the appellate court to require a *remittitur* in such cases was not to be considered in the trial courts for any purpose, the court said: "The task of revising jury verdicts in matters of amount is both difficult and delicate, and it ought not to be rendered more so by an invitation to the jury to resolve all doubts in favor of a large verdict, thus passing up to the trial judge and to this court a duty which is not only primarily but finally theirs."

WILLS—LEGATEE CONTESTING INSTRUMENT—FORFEITURE OF INTEREST.—The enforcement of the penalty of forfeiture of interest, imposed by a will upon a legatee who attempts to contest the instrument, is denied *In re Friend* (Pa.), 68 L. R. A. 447, where it clearly appears that the contest to have the will set aside was justified under the circumstances, and was not the mere vexatious act of a disappointed beneficiary. A note to this case reviews the other authorities on effect of provision in will that any beneficiary who contests the instrument shall forfeit his interest.

JUDGMENT AND VERDICT—EXCESSIVE VERDICT—REDUCTION BY JUDGE.—The practice, in case of an excessive verdict, of naming a sum for which judgment may be rendered at the option of one of the parties, is held, in *Heimlich v. Tabor* (Wis.) 68 L. R. A. 669, not to violate the rights of either party if grounded upon the proper basis.

REAL ESTATE—LIFE TENANT FORFEITING TO REMAINDERMAN FOR WANTON WASTE—A remainderman is held, in *Roby v. Newton* (Ga.) 68 L. R. A. 601, to be entitled to the forfeiture of the life tenant's interest because of waste only when it appears that there has been both permissive and voluntary waste by the tenant, or one for whom he was responsible, and that the voluntary waste was committed wantonly.

RAILROADS—PASSENGERS—ROUND-TRIP TICKETS—EXTENSION OF TIME.—The inability of a railroad company to perform its contract to carry the purchaser of a round-trip, limited ticket on his return journey because of a strike is held, in *Elliott v. Southern P. Co.* (Cal.) 68 L. R. A. 393, not to extend the time within which it is bound to honor the ticket.

LANDLORD AND TENANT—TENANTS RIGHT TO CUT TREES FOR FIREWOOD.—The right of a tenant to cut for firewood trees planted to meet some special purpose of the landlord, or to cut trees growing in their native state, is denied in *Anderson v. Cowan* (Iowa), 68 L. R. A. 641, unless they are such